

(= Abū Ḥanifa) that, in their place, cotton grew so as to reach the height of an apricot tree, and lasted twenty years»; Abū Ḥanifa continues by saying that « the best (cotton) was the one which was recent and had been sowed in the course of the year » (cf. LECLERC, *Traité des simples*, III, 92-93). Polo says the same.

So we know from the *Wu lu* that a true cotton, the *Gossypium arboreum*, was cultivated in Yung-ch'ang in the last quarter of the 3rd cent. Now, it is precisely in the region of Yung-ch'ang that the *Hua-yang kuo-chih* and the *Hou-Han shu* mention the *po-tieh* cloth of the Ai-lao. The *Hua-yang kuo-chih* is slightly later in date than the *Wu lu*, so that the interpretation of *po-tieh* as « white [true] cotton cloth » would make no difficulty. As to the *Hou-Han shu*, it is true that, in principle, it deals with a period earlier than the *Wu lu*; but we have seen that, in the present case, it seems in fact to be indebted to the *Hua-yang kuo-chih*. Even if it were not so and if both works had copied from a lost and unknown source of the Han period, we should have to go back only to the 2nd cent. A. D., one century before the *Wu lu*, and there is no reason to suppose that the cultivation of cotton had just begun in western Yün-nan when the *Wu lu* was written. I have long thought of devoting a special memoir to the route between Burma and Yün-nan, a route which was already known to Greek geographers and which has been of much greater moment in the history of civilization than is generally believed. The early introduction of cotton cultivation into western Yün-nan is but a link in a long chain.

From the *Wu lu* again, we know that, in the 3rd cent., true cotton, represented by the *Gossypium arboreum*, was cultivated not only in western Yün-nan, but also in North Annam and Tongking. Both regions formed part of the Chinese Empire, but they were border provinces, and cotton was still unknown in China proper, except as an imported ware. The same location of *mu-mien* in western Yün-nan and Tongking occurs in the extant fragments of the *Kuang chih* (cf. *supra*, p. 462). In the 4th cent., the *Lo-fou shan chi*, devoted in theory to what was to be found on that mountain of Kuang-tung, speaks of *mu-mien*, which, in the first month, produced flowers similar to those of the *fu-jung* (« nelumbium », or « hibiscus »; cf. *supra*, p. 461), and a floss out of which Southerners made cotton wool. The early flowering and the fact that the text speaks of the floss as being used not for making cloth, but for stuffing, would favour the hypothesis that we find already in this early text the confusion, well attested in Ming times, which transferred the designation *mu-mien* from the *Gossypium* to the *Bombax*. The same doubt may be entertained as to the value of *mu-mien* in a passage of the *Nan-yüeh chih* (cf. *supra*, p. 462) and in an anonymous *Kuang-chou chi*, probably pre-T'ang in date, which says that the *mu-mien* occurs in Tongking and Kuang-tung (cf. *supra*, p. 462). But the fact remains that, already before the T'ang dynasty, there was some *mu-mien* growing in Kuang-tung; and we must not forget that Hai-nan was part of Kuang-tung province.

That *Gossypium arboreum*, and not *Gossypium herbaceum*, was the species mainly grown in eastern Indo-China in the 6th cent. seems to be established by the description given in *Liang shu*, 54, 1 b (copied also into *Nan shih*, 78, 1 b). The text speaks of the products of Lin-i (= Champa), which included *chi-pei* (*ku-pei* in *Nan shih*), and adds : « *Chi-pei* is the name of a tree (*shu*; not *ts'ao*, 'plant'). When its flowers are completely formed, they are like goose down. [The people] pull out the filaments (緒 *hsü*) and spin them so as to make a cloth which